arXiv:1402.3554v2 [hep-th] 10 Jul 2014

Einstein-Hilbert graviton modes modified by the Lorentz-violating bumblebee Field

R. V. Maluf,[1,*] C. A. S. Almeida,[1,†] R. Casana,[2,‡] and M. M. Ferreira Jr[2,§]

[1]*Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal do Ceará (UFC), Campus Universitário do Pici, Caixa Postal 6030, 60455-760 - Fortaleza, Ceará, Brazil*

[2]*Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal do Maranhão (UFMA), Campus Universitário do Bacanga, 65085-580, São Luis, Maranhão, Brazil*

Abstract

In this work, we investigate the consequences of the spontaneous breaking of Lorentz symmetry, triggered by the bumblebee vector field, on the usual Einstein-Hilbert theory. Specifically, we consider the Einstein-Hilbert action modified by the bumblebee dynamic field, and evaluate the graviton propagator using an extended basis of Barnes-Rivers tensor projectors, involving the Lorentz-violating vector. Once the propagator is carried out, we proceed with discussing the consistency of the model, writing the dispersion relations, and analyzing causality and unitarity. We verify that this model possesses two dispersion relations: one provides causal and unitary propagating modes, while the second yields a causal but nonunitary mode which spoils the physical consistency of the model.

PACS numbers: 11.30.Cp, 04.25.Nx, 12.60.-i

*Electronic address: r.v.maluf@fisica.ufc.br

†Electronic address: carlos@fisica.ufc.br

‡Electronic address: rodolfo.casana@gmail.com

§Electronic address: manojr.ufma@gmail.com

I. INTRODUCTION

Theories with Lorentz-symmetry breaking have been under intensive investigation since the proposal of the standard model extension (SME) [1–10] as a broader version of the usual standard model incorporating tensor terms generated by spontaneous Lorentz violation. The Lorentz-violating (LV) terms, generated as vacuum expectation values of tensors defined in a high energy scale, are coupled to the physical fields yielding coordinate invariance and violation of Lorentz symmetry in the particle frames [11]. This theoretical framework has inspired a large number of investigations in the last several years, encompassing fermion systems [12–20], CPT-probing experiments [21–27], the electromagnetic CPT- and Lorentz-odd term [28]-[41], the CPT-even and Lorentz-odd gauge sector and its interactions with fermions [42–51], [52–57]. Recent investigations involving higher dimensional operators [58–60], its possible connections with LV theories [61–66], and nonminimal couplings [67–72], have also been reported.

The interest in an extension of the SME embracing gravity comes from the fact that Lorentz violation may be a key ingredient of a quantum theory for gravitation. Indeed, Lorentz-violating effects might be significant in regions or situations were the curvature or torsion are large, as in the vicinity of black holes. Furthermore, these effects may also play relevant role in cosmological scenarios described by dark energy or dark matter, or the ones where anisotropy factors can be inserted in the Friedman-Robertson-Walker solutions. Lorentz violation in the gravitational sector may be theoretically investigated in connection with tests sensitive to the inverse square law, the deflection of light, geodesic precession, between others. A consistent formalism to include LV terms in gravity requires a framework compatible with non-null vacuum expectation values that break local Lorentz symmetry but keeps the general coordinate invariance. The Riemann-Cartan geometry, endowed with dynamic curvature and torsion, was used for such a purpose in Ref. [73], where the LV coupling terms were constructed using vierbein and spin connections. In Ref. [74], the connection between Nambu-Goldstone modes and the spontaneous violation of local Lorentz and diffeomorphism symmetries were investigated in the Riemann-Cartan spacetime using the vierbein and spin connection formalism previously developed. In Ref. [75], signals for Lorentz violation in post-Newtonian gravity were scrutinized in the case of a Riemann spacetime (null torsion) by considering the linearized Einstein equations modified by 20

independent dynamical LV coefficients generated by spontaneous symmetry breaking. New developments were performed in Refs. [76, 78]. Also, alternative approaches for Lorentz violation in curved space, focused on a more geometric point of view, have been discussed in Refs. [79–81]. Investigations about Lorentz-violating linearized gravitation [82] and high order gravity models modified by Lorentz-violating terms were also reported [83, 84].

In accordance with these studies the extension of the gravitational sector including Lorentz-violating terms is given by the action

$$S = S_{EH} + S_{LV} + S_{matter}, \tag{1}$$

where S_{EH} represents the usual Einstein-Hilbert action,

$$S_{EH} = \int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\frac{2}{\kappa^2}\left(R - 2\Lambda\right), \tag{2}$$

where R is the curvature scalar and Λ is the cosmological constant. Moreover, the action S_{LV} accounts for Lorentz-violating leading terms, written as

$$S_{LV} = \int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\frac{2}{\kappa^2}\left(uR + s^{\mu\nu}R_{\mu\nu} + t^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}R_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}\right), \tag{3}$$

with u, $s^{\mu\nu}$ and $t^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}$ being tensors which enclose the Lorentz-violating coefficients, and $\kappa^2 = 32\pi G$ being the gravitational coupling. The dimensionless tensors $s^{\mu\nu}$, $t^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}$ possess the same symmetries of the Ricci and Riemann tensors, respectively, and are to be considered as traceless, $s^{\mu}{}_{\mu} = t^{\mu\nu}{}_{\mu\nu} = 0$, once their traces can be absorbed in the scalar u. Moreover, the components $t^{\mu\nu\beta}{}_{\nu}$ can be also taken as null once they can be absorbed in the tensor $s^{\mu\beta}$. So, the tensors $s^{\mu\nu}$, $t^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}$ have nine and ten independent components, respectively.

The bumblebee model is a simple example of gravity model where a vector field B^{μ} acquires a nonzero vacuum expectation value inducing Lorentz and diffeomorphism violations. This model was first considered in the context of string theories [4], with the spontaneous Lorentz-symmetry breaking being triggered by the potential $V(B^{\mu}) = \lambda\left(B^{\mu}B_{\mu} \mp b^2\right)^2/2$. In accordance with the literature [73, 74], the vector bumblebee model can be represented as stated in action (3), whenever $t^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} = 0$ and

$$u = \frac{1}{4}\xi B^{\alpha}B_{\alpha}, \quad s^{\mu\nu} = \xi\left(B^{\mu}B^{\nu} - \frac{1}{4}g^{\mu\nu}B^{\alpha}B_{\alpha}\right), \tag{4}$$

with $s^{\mu\nu}$ being traceless. With such definitions, the action responsible for the dynamics of the bumblebee field B_{μ} is written as

$$S_B = \int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\left[-\frac{1}{4}B^{\mu\nu}B_{\mu\nu} + \frac{2\xi}{\kappa^2}B^{\mu}B^{\nu}R_{\mu\nu} - V(B^{\mu}B_{\mu} \mp b^2)\right], \tag{5}$$

where we have included the corresponding field strength

$$B_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu B_\nu - \partial_\nu B_\mu, \tag{6}$$

and the quadratic potential,

$$V = \frac{\lambda}{2}\left(B^\mu B_\mu \mp b^2\right)^2. \tag{7}$$

that triggers the spontaneous breakdown of diffeomorphism symmetry. Here, b^2 is a positive constant that stands for the nonzero vacuum expectation value of this field. All quantities are expressed in natural units ($\hbar = c = \epsilon_0 = 1$), including the gravitational constant, $G = 6.707 \times 10^{-57}(\text{eV})^{-2}$, so that the mass dimension of constants and fields are $[\kappa^2] = -2, [B^\mu] = 1, [B^{\mu\nu}] = 2$, $[\lambda] = 0, [\xi] = -2$. The constant ξ is the one that establishes the nonminimal coupling between the bumblebee field and the curvature tensor, keeping u and $s^{\mu\nu}$ dimensionless. Moreover, tensors are symmetrized with unit weight, i.e., $A_{(\mu\nu)} = \frac{1}{2}(A_{\mu\nu} + A_{\nu\mu})$.

In Ref. [75], the effects of the linearized version of the bumblebee model on the Einstein-Hilbert gravity were analyzed. This model was also addressed in Refs. [76–78]. Some additional implications of this model on the Newtonian gravitational potential have been recently addressed in Ref. [85], where the weak-field formalism of gravity was used to calculate the bumblebee corrections induced on the gravitational potential. It was then shown that the coupling of this field with the curvature tensor, as stated in action (5), implies an anisotropic potential correction proportional to $b_i b_j \hat{x}^i \hat{x}^j$, which breaks the spatial isotropy of the ordinary gravitational potential. Besides, an additional correction similar to the well known electric Darwin term, $\nabla^2 \frac{1}{r} \sim \delta^{(3)}(\vec{x})$ was also reported, giving rise to a very weak and short-ranged contribution to the gravitational interaction.

In spite of the fact that the results of Ref. [85] are consistent with the literature [75, 78], they are based on a preliminary form of the Einstein-Hilbert graviton propagator modified by the linearized bumblebee field, evaluated as a perturbative insertion on the usual case. This approach, however, does not provide an exact result, being not suitable to analyze the vacuum structure of this model and the properties of the physical excitations around it. It is known that the spontaneous Lorentz breaking is always accompanied by diffeomorphism violation [74–76], so the graviton spectrum may undergo nontrivial modifications, as the generation of massive modes, the appearance of nonphysical modes concerning causality (tachyons) and unitarity aspects (ghosts).

In this work, we intend to investigate the graviton spectrum in the context of the linearized Einstein-Hilbert gravity (without torsion) endowed with the spontaneous violation of Lorentz symmetry induced by the bumblebee field, as studied in Ref. [85]. In this sense, we exactly carry out the graviton propagator (in tree-level approximation) applying a general method based on the Barnes-Rivers spin operators [86–88] and recently extended in Ref. [84] for the case of gravity theories with Lorentz-breaking terms. Once the graviton Feynman propagator is evaluated, one also analyzes the consistency (stability, causality, unitarity) of this theory starting from the dispersion relations stemming from the poles of the propagator. In the present work we use the spacetime signature $(+\ -\ -\ -)$ and adopt the following definition for the Ricci tensor: $R_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\sigma \Gamma^\sigma_{\mu\nu} - \partial_\nu \Gamma^\sigma_{\mu\sigma} + \Gamma^\lambda_{\sigma\lambda}\Gamma^\sigma_{\mu\nu} - \Gamma^\lambda_{\sigma\nu}\Gamma^\sigma_{\mu\lambda}$, where $\Gamma^\lambda_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2} g^{\lambda\sigma}\left(\partial_\mu g_{\nu\sigma} + \partial_\nu g_{\mu\sigma} - \partial_\sigma g_{\mu\nu}\right)$.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Sec. II we present the linearized bilinear gravity action for which we evaluate the Feynman propagator, using an extended basis of the Barnes-Rivers projectors. In Sec. III, we present the dispersion relations coming from the poles of the propagator, and discuss the stability and causality issues. The unitarity analysis is investigated in Sec. IV, while our concluding comments are presented in Sec. VI.

II. THEORETICAL MODEL AND THE GRAVITON PROPAGATOR

In order to determine the influence of the gravity-bumblebee coupling on the graviton dynamics, we consider the actions (3) and (5), following the route described in Refs.[75, 78, 85]. For assessing the linearized version, we split the dynamic fields into the vacuum expectation values and the nearby quantum fluctuations:

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\mu\nu} &= \eta_{\mu\nu} + \kappa h_{\mu\nu}, \\ B_\mu &= b_\mu + \tilde{B}_\mu, \\ B^\mu &= b^\mu + \tilde{B}^\mu - \kappa b_\nu h^{\mu\nu}, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where $h_{\mu\nu}$ and $\tilde{B}_\mu$ represent small perturbations around the Minkowski background and a constant vacuum value b_μ, respectively. The quantity $b^\mu = (b_0, \mathbf{b})$ represents the fixed background responsible for the violation of Lorentz and CPT symmetries in the local frame of particles [73].

Following the procedure outlined in Ref. [75], the solution for the linearized bumblebee

equation of motion can be written in the momentum space as

$$\tilde{B}^{\mu}=\frac{\kappa p^{\mu}b_{\alpha}b_{\beta}h^{\alpha\beta}}{2\left(b\cdot p\right)}+\frac{2\sigma b_{\alpha}R^{\alpha\mu}}{p^{2}}-\frac{2\sigma p^{\mu}b_{\alpha}b_{\beta}R^{\alpha\beta}}{p^{2}\left(b\cdot p\right)}+\frac{\sigma p^{\mu}R}{4\lambda\left(b\cdot p\right)}-\frac{\sigma b^{\mu}R}{p^{2}}+\frac{\sigma p^{\mu}b^{2}R}{p^{2}\left(b\cdot p\right)}, \tag{9}$$

with $p^{\mu}=(p_{0},\mathbf{p})$, $\sigma=(2\xi/\kappa^{2})$, while $R_{\mu\nu}$ and R are taken in linearized form. So, we can insert this solution into the Lagrangian term representing the bumblebee interaction, $\mathcal{L}_{\rm LV}=\sigma\sqrt{-g}B^{\mu}B^{\nu}R_{\mu\nu}$, to determine the modifications implied by the background b_{μ} on the kinetic sector of the graviton field $h_{\mu\nu}$, yielding the following effective Lagrangian (already evaluated in Ref. [85]):

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{\rm LV} &= \xi\left[p^{2}b_{\mu}b_{\nu}\left(h^{\mu\nu}h+h^{\mu\alpha}h^{\nu}{}_{\alpha}\right)-\frac{1}{2}\left(b\cdot p\right)^{2}\left(h^{\mu\nu}h_{\mu\nu}-h^{2}\right)-\left(b_{\mu}b_{\nu}p_{\alpha}p_{\beta}+b_{(\mu}p_{\nu)}b_{(\alpha}p_{\beta)}\right)h^{\mu\nu}h^{\alpha\beta}\right]\\ &+\frac{4\xi^{2}}{\kappa^{2}}\left[\left(-2p^{2}b_{\mu}b_{\nu}-2b^{2}p_{\mu}p_{\nu}+4\left(b\cdot p\right)b_{(\mu}p_{\nu)}-\frac{p^{2}p_{\mu}p_{\nu}}{4\lambda}\right)h^{\mu\nu}h\right.\\ &+\left(2b_{\mu}b_{\nu}p_{\alpha}p_{\beta}-b_{(\mu}p_{\nu)}b_{(\alpha}p_{\beta)}+\frac{b^{2}p_{\mu}p_{\nu}p_{\alpha}p_{\beta}}{p^{2}}-\frac{2\left(b\cdot p\right)p_{\mu}p_{\nu}b_{(\alpha}p_{\beta)}}{p^{2}}+\frac{p_{\mu}p_{\nu}p_{\alpha}p_{\beta}}{4\lambda}\right)h^{\mu\nu}h^{\alpha\beta}\\ &+\left.\left(b^{2}p^{2}-\left(b\cdot p\right)^{2}+\frac{p^{4}}{4\lambda}\right)h^{2}+\left(p^{2}b_{\mu}b_{\nu}-2(b\cdot p)b_{(\mu}p_{\nu)}+\frac{\left(b\cdot p\right)^{2}p_{\mu}p_{\nu}}{p^{2}}\right)h^{\mu\lambda}h^{\nu}{}_{\lambda}\right],\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where $h=h^{\alpha}{}_{\alpha}$. As expected, it is possible to verify that the Lagrangian (10) is not invariant under the gauge transformations $h_{\mu\nu}\rightarrow h_{\mu\nu}+ip_{\mu}\zeta_{\nu}+ip_{\nu}\zeta_{\mu}$, for any arbitrary ζ_{μ}. Furthermore, it is worth noting that there are second-order corrections $\mathcal{O}(\xi^{2})$ which introduce higher derivative terms, and are background independent.

Another observation concerns the existing connection between the terms involving the bumblebee field in the squared linearized Lagrangian (10) and the ones stemming from higher order Lagrangian terms, as $\mathcal{L}=\beta R_{\mu\nu}R^{\mu\nu}+\gamma R^{2}$, as depicted in Refs. [83, 84, 89–91]. We can show that the linearized terms associated with R^{2}, $R_{\mu\nu}R^{\mu\nu}$, namely, $h\Box^{2}h$, $h\Box\partial_{\mu}\partial_{\nu}h^{\mu\nu}$, $h^{\alpha\beta}\partial_{\alpha}\partial_{\beta}\partial_{\mu}\partial_{\nu}h^{\mu\nu}$, $h^{\mu\nu}\Box^{2}h^{\mu\nu}$, can be also found in Lagrangian (10). This shows that the bumblebee field also plays the role of inducing high order gravity terms on the Einstein-Hilbert action.

Following the purpose of analyzing the effects of the bumblebee field on the Einstein-Hilbert action, we should add the Lorentz-violating terms of Eq. (10) to the bilinear terms of the linearized Einstein-Hilbert Lagrangian,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm EH}=p_{\mu}p_{\alpha}h^{\mu\nu}h^{\alpha}{}_{\nu}-p_{\mu}p_{\nu}h^{\mu\nu}h+\frac{1}{2}p^{2}h^{\mu}{}_{\mu}h-\frac{1}{2}p^{2}h^{\mu\nu}h_{\mu\nu}. \tag{11}$$

without introducing a gauge fixing-term. Our interest is the kinetic Lagrangian,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm kin}=\mathcal{L}_{EH}+\mathcal{L}_{\rm LV}. \tag{12}$$

To find the corresponding Feynman propagator for $\mathcal{L}_{\rm kin}$, we first rewrite the resulting Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_{\rm kin}$ into the bilinear form

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm kin} = -\frac{1}{2} h^{\mu\nu} \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} h^{\alpha\beta}, \tag{13}$$

where the operator $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta}$ is symmetric in the indices $(\mu\nu)$, $(\alpha\beta)$, and under the interchange of the pairs $(\mu\nu)$ and $(\alpha\beta)$. Following the notations and conventions of Ref. [85], the graviton propagator is defined as

$$\langle 0 \left| T \left[h_{\mu\nu}(x) h_{\alpha\beta}(y) \right] \right| 0 \rangle = D_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta}(x-y), \tag{14}$$

where $D_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta}$ is the operator that satisfies the Green's equation, given as

$$\hat{\mathcal{O}}^{\mu\nu,}{}_{\lambda\sigma} D^{\lambda\sigma,\alpha\beta}(x-y) = i\mathcal{I}^{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} \delta^4(x-y), \tag{15}$$

with $\mathcal{I}^{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\eta^{\mu\alpha}\eta^{\nu\beta} + \eta^{\mu\beta}\eta^{\nu\alpha}\right)$ playing the role of the identity operator. Thus, the problem of determining the propagator is reduced to the inversion of the operator $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$, given in Eq. (13). Once found a closed operator algebra composed of a set of appropriated tensor projectors with which the operator $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ can be expanded, the inversion of the operator becomes a tedious but straightforward task.

As it is well known, a convenient method for obtaining the inverse of symmetric rank-two tensors is based on the spin projector operators found by Barnes and Rivers [84, 86–88] which constitute a complete orthonormal basis of operators for Lorentz-invariant models in four dimensions. This basis is shown in Eq. (A1). To accommodate the emerging terms containing the LV background vector b^μ in gravity theories, an extended basis of the Barnes-Rivers projectors was devised in Ref. [84]. All tools needed to invert our operator $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ are outlined in the Appendix.

Using the spin-projection operators and the identities as given in the Appendix A, we are able to put the operator $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ in the form (where for simplicity we adopt the notation AB in place of $A^{\mu\nu}{}_{\rho\sigma} B^{\rho\sigma\alpha\beta}$ to the contractions)

$$\hat{\mathcal{O}} = a_1 \mathrm{P}^{(1)} + a_2 \mathrm{P}^{(2)} + a_3 \mathrm{P}^{(0-\theta)} + a_4 \mathrm{P}^{(0-\theta\omega)} + a_5 \tilde{\Pi}^{(1)} + a_6 \tilde{\Pi}^{(2)} + a_7 \tilde{\Pi}^{(\theta\Sigma)} + a_8 \tilde{\Pi}^{(\theta\Lambda)}, \tag{16}$$

with the scalar coefficients a_i being functions of the momentum and the background vector

b^μ given explicitly by

$$
\begin{aligned}
a_1 &= -\frac{4\xi^2(b\cdot p)^2}{\kappa^2} + \xi(b\cdot p)^2, \quad a_2 = \xi(b\cdot p)^2 + p^2, \\
a_3 &= \frac{24\xi^2\,\boxdot\,(p)}{\kappa^2} - \frac{6\xi^2 p^4}{\kappa^2\lambda} - 2\xi(b\cdot p)^2 - 2p^2, \; a_5 = \frac{4\xi^2\,(b\cdot p)}{\kappa^2}, \\
a_4 &= \frac{8\sqrt{3}\xi^2(b\cdot p)^2}{\kappa^2} - \sqrt{3}\xi(b\cdot p)^2, \; a_6 = -\frac{4\xi^2 p^2}{\kappa^2} - \xi p^2, \\
a_7 &= -\frac{8\sqrt{3}\xi^2\,(b\cdot p)}{\kappa^2}, \; a_8 = \frac{8\sqrt{3}\xi^2 p^2}{\kappa^2} - \sqrt{3}\xi p^2.
\end{aligned}
\tag{17}
$$

Note that the projectors $\tilde{\Pi}$, defined in the Appendix A, are the ones carrying the bumblebee field. The upper tilde symbol is used to highlight the difference in relation to the projectors first defined in Ref. [84].

After a lengthy computation, and using the identity $\hat{\mathcal{O}}\hat{\mathcal{O}}^{-1} = I$, we are able to write the operator $\hat{\mathcal{O}}^{-1}$ in terms of the whole set of projectors, as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\hat{\mathcal{O}}^{-1} &= b_1\mathrm{P}^{(1)} + b_2\mathrm{P}^{(2)} + b_3\mathrm{P}^{(0-\theta)} + b_4\mathrm{P}^{(0-\omega)} + b_5\mathrm{P}^{(0-\theta\omega)} + b_6\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)} + b_7\tilde{\Pi}^{(2)} + b_8\tilde{\Pi}^{(\theta\Sigma)} \\
&+ b_9\tilde{\Pi}^{(\theta\Lambda)} + b_{10}\tilde{\Pi}^{(\Lambda\Lambda)} + b_{11}\tilde{\Pi}^{(\omega\Lambda-a)} + b_{12}\tilde{\Pi}^{(\omega\Lambda-b)} + b_{13}\tilde{\Pi}^{(\omega\Sigma)} + b_{14}\tilde{\Pi}^{(\Lambda\Sigma)},
\end{aligned}
\tag{18}
$$

where the coefficients b_i are constrained by a set of fourteen algebraic equations. Solving them, we obtain the coefficients

$$
\begin{aligned}
b_1 &= \frac{N_1}{\kappa^2\xi^2(b\cdot p)^2\,\boxdot\,\boxplus}, \; b_2 = \frac{1}{\boxplus}, \; b_3 = -\frac{1}{2\boxplus}, \; b_4 = \frac{N_4}{2\lambda\kappa^2\xi^2(b\cdot p)^4\,\boxdot^2\,\boxplus}, \\
b_5 &= \frac{N_5}{2\xi(b\cdot p)^2\,\boxdot\,\boxplus}, \; b_6 = \frac{p^2}{\xi(b\cdot p)\,\boxdot\,\boxplus}, \; b_7 = \frac{p^2}{\boxdot\boxplus}, \; b_8 = \frac{N_8}{4\xi(b\cdot p)\,\boxdot\,\boxplus}, \\
b_9 &= -\frac{\sqrt{3}p^2}{2\,\boxdot\,\boxplus}, \; b_{10} = \frac{p^4}{2\,\boxdot^2\,\boxplus}, \; b_{11} = \frac{N_{11}}{8\xi^2(b\cdot p)^2\,\boxdot^2\,\boxplus}, \; b_{12} = \frac{N_{12}}{2\xi(b\cdot p)^2\,\boxdot^2\,\boxplus}, \\
b_{13} &= \frac{N_{13}}{4\kappa^2\xi^2(b\cdot p)^3\,\boxdot^2\,\boxplus}, \; b_{14} = \frac{N_{14}}{4\xi\,(b\cdot p)\,\boxdot^2\,\boxplus},
\end{aligned}
\tag{19}
$$

where one has used $\boxplus = \boxplus(p)$ and $\boxdot = \boxdot(p)$, defined by the following expressions

$$
\boxplus(p) = p^2 + \xi(b\cdot p)^2, \tag{20}
$$

$$
\boxdot(p) = (b\cdot p)^2 - b^2p^2. \tag{21}
$$

Furthermore, the numerators N_i follow

$$N_1 = \xi(4\xi+\kappa^2)\,\boxdot\boxplus + \kappa^2 p^4, \tag{22}$$

$$N_4 = \xi^2\,\boxdot^2\left[p^2F_1(p) + \lambda\kappa^2(b\cdot p)^4\right] + 4\lambda\xi\kappa^2p^2(b\cdot p)^4\boxdot \tag{23}$$
$$+\,\xi^3(b\cdot p)^2\,\boxdot^2 F_1(p) - \lambda\kappa^2p^4\left[b^4p^4 - 4(b\cdot p)^4 + 2b^2p^2(b\cdot p)^2\right],$$

$$N_5 = \sqrt{3}\left[-\xi(b\cdot p)^2\,\boxdot + b^2p^4\right],\ N_8 = \sqrt{3}\left(\xi(b\cdot p)^2 - p^2\right), \tag{24}$$

$$N_{11} = p^2\left(p^2 - \xi(b\cdot p)^2\right)^2,\ N_{12} = p^4\left(2b^2p^2 - 3(b\cdot p)^2\right) - 2\xi p^2(b\cdot p)^2\boxdot, \tag{25}$$

$$N_{13} = F_2(p)\,\xi^2\,\boxdot - 16\xi^3(b\cdot p)^2\,\boxdot^2 + \xi\kappa^2b^2p^4\left[2(b\cdot p)^2 - b^2p^2\right] \tag{26}$$
$$+\,\kappa^2p^4\left[2b^2p^2 - 3(b\cdot p)^2\right],$$

$$N_{14} = p^2\left[p^2 - \xi(b\cdot p)^2\right], \tag{27}$$

and

$$F_1(p) = 16\lambda(b\cdot p)^2 + 16\lambda b^2p^2 + p^4, \tag{28}$$

$$F_2(p) = \kappa^2(b\cdot p)^2\left[(b\cdot p)^2 + b^2p^2\right] + 16p^2\left[b^2p^2 - (b\cdot p)^2\right]. \tag{29}$$

The Feynman propagator is

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta}(p) = \frac{i}{\boxplus(p)}\Bigg\{ & \frac{N_1}{\kappa^2\xi^2(b\cdot p)^2\boxdot}\mathrm{P}^{(1)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} + \mathrm{P}^{(2)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{P}^{(0-\theta)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} + \frac{N_4}{2\lambda\kappa^2\xi^2(b\cdot p)^2\boxdot^2}\mathrm{P}^{(0-\omega)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} \\ & + \frac{p^2}{\boxdot}\tilde{\Pi}^{(2)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} + \frac{N_5}{2\xi(b\cdot p)^2\boxdot}\mathrm{P}^{(0-\theta\omega)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} + \frac{p^2}{\xi(b\cdot p)\boxdot}\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} + \frac{N_8}{4\xi(b\cdot p)\boxdot}\tilde{\Pi}^{(\theta\Sigma)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} \\ & - \frac{\sqrt{3}p^2}{2\boxdot}\tilde{\Pi}^{(\theta\Lambda)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} + \frac{p^4}{2\boxdot^2}\tilde{\Pi}^{(\Lambda\Lambda)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} + \frac{N_{11}}{8\xi^2(b\cdot p)^2\boxdot^2}\tilde{\Pi}^{(\omega\Lambda-a)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} \\ & + \frac{N_{12}}{2\xi(b\cdot p)^2\boxdot^2}\tilde{\Pi}^{(\omega\Lambda-b)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} + \frac{N_{13}}{4\kappa^2\xi^2(b\cdot p)^3\boxdot^2}\tilde{\Pi}^{(\omega\Sigma)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} + \frac{N_{14}}{4\xi(b\cdot p)\boxdot^2}\tilde{\Pi}^{(\Lambda\Sigma)}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta}\Bigg\}. \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

The next step is to read off the graviton dispersion relations from the poles of the propagator, aiming at verifying the consistency of the theory concerning causality and unitarity respects.

III. DISPERSION RELATIONS

In this section, we analyze the dispersion relations stemming from the poles of the graviton propagator, which provide information about the stability and causality of the modes.

We begin considering the pole $\boxplus(p)$, which implies

$$p^2 + \xi(b\cdot p)^2 = 0. \tag{31}$$

For the timelike configuration, $b^\mu = (b_0, \mathbf{0})$, the corresponding dispersion relation is

$$p_0 = \pm\frac{|\mathbf{p}|}{\sqrt{1+\xi b_0^2}}, \tag{32}$$

which is a positive energy mode and yields the group velocity

$$u_g = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\xi b_0^2}}, \tag{33}$$

which is smaller than 1 for $\xi > 0$, implying causality assurance for $\xi > 0$.

For the spacelike configuration, $b^\mu = (0, \mathbf{b})$, the dispersion relation is

$$p_0 = \pm\,|\mathbf{p}|\,\sqrt{1-\xi\,|\mathbf{b}|^2\cos^2\theta}, \tag{34}$$

where $(b\cdot p) = |\mathbf{b}|\,|\mathbf{p}|\cos\theta$. This is a positive energy mode, related with the group velocity

$$u_g = \sqrt{1-\xi\,|\mathbf{b}|^2\cos^2\theta}, \tag{35}$$

which becomes smaller than 1 for $\xi > 0$ and $\xi\,|\mathbf{b}|^2 < 1$. So, this mode is causal for $\xi > 0$ for both configurations.

For the pole $\boxdot(p)$, the associated dispersion relation is given by the roots of

$$(b\cdot p)^2 - b^2p^2 = 0. \tag{36}$$

In a general background, $b^\mu = (b_0, \mathbf{b})$, the dispersion relation is

$$p_0 = \frac{|\mathbf{p}|}{|\mathbf{b}|}\left[b_0\cos\theta \pm \sqrt{\left(|\mathbf{b}|^2 - b_0^2\right)\sin^2\theta}\right], \tag{37}$$

It becomes clear that the condition $|\mathbf{b}|^2 > b_0^2$ ensures the existence of real roots. Hence, the background b^μ must be spacelike. In order to facilitate the analysis, we adopt the simplest spacelike background, $b^\mu = (0, \mathbf{b})$, which is equivalent to any other spacelike choice due to the observer Lorentz symmetry. For this background, the dispersion relation appears as

$$p_0 = \pm\,|\mathbf{p}|\sin\theta, \tag{38}$$

providing a causal mode, $u_g = \sin\theta \leq 1$, whose energy presents a strong dependence on the direction of propagation. Besides this physically unusual behavior, the relation (38) yields a nonunitary mode, as it will be shown in the next section.

IV. TREE-LEVEL UNITARITY

The tree-level unitarity analysis of this model is performed through the saturation of the Feynman propagator with external currents. This method is usually applied in quantum field theory [92], being implemented by means of the saturated propagator (SP), $SP = J^{*\mu}\mathrm{Res}(\Delta_{\mu\nu})\ J^{\nu}$, a scalar quantity given by the contraction of the external currents (J^{μ}) with $\mathrm{Res}(\Delta_{\mu\nu})$ - the residue of the propagator evaluated at each pole. The conserved current, $\partial_{\mu}J^{\mu} = 0$, implies $p_{\mu}J^{\mu} = 0$. This method was already used to analyze unitarity in the gauge sector of the SME [93].

For the rank-two graviton field, this method can also be equally applied. In this case the saturated residue of propagator is written as

$$SP = J^{\mu\nu}\left(\mathrm{Res}D_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda}\right)J^{\kappa\lambda}, \tag{39}$$

where $(\mathrm{Res}D_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda})$ is the residue evaluated at each pole of the propagator, and $J^{\mu\nu}$ is a symmetric tensor describing an external conserved current ($\partial_{\mu}J^{\mu\nu} = 0$), which in momentum space reads as $p_{\mu}J^{\mu\nu} = 0$. In accordance with this method, the unitarity analysis is assured whenever the imaginary part of the saturation SP (at the poles of the propagator) is positive.

Because of the conservation law, $p_{\mu}J^{\mu\nu} = 0$, all the projector terms involving $\omega_{\mu\nu}$ and $\Sigma_{\mu\nu}$ yield null saturation. Hence, non-null contribution for saturation stems only from the following terms:

$$\begin{aligned}
J^{\mu\nu}\mathrm{P}^{(2)}{}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda}J^{\kappa\lambda} &= J_{\kappa\lambda}J^{\kappa\lambda} - \frac{1}{3}\left(J^{\kappa}{}_{\kappa}\right)^2, \\
J^{\mu\nu}\mathrm{P}^{(0-\theta)}{}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda}J^{\kappa\lambda} &= \frac{1}{3}\left(J^{\kappa}{}_{\kappa}\right)^2, \\
J^{\mu\nu}\tilde{\Pi}^{(2)}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda}J^{\kappa\lambda} &= 2b_{\nu}J^{\nu}{}_{\kappa}b_{\lambda}J^{\lambda\kappa}\ , \\
J^{\mu\nu}\tilde{\Pi}^{(\theta\Lambda)}{}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda}J^{\kappa\lambda} &= \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}J^{\kappa}{}_{\kappa}b_{\mu}b_{\nu}J^{\mu\nu}, \\
J^{\mu\nu}\tilde{\Pi}^{(\Lambda\Lambda)}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda}J^{\kappa\lambda} &= J^{\mu\nu}b_{\mu}b_{\nu}b_{\kappa}b_{\lambda}J^{\kappa\lambda}.
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

Using the Feynman propagator (30) and the current conservation, the propagator saturated by conserved currents reads

$$SP = \frac{J_{\kappa\lambda}J^{\kappa\lambda} - \frac{1}{2}\left(J^{\kappa}{}_{\kappa}\right)^2}{\boxplus} + \frac{2p^2b_{\nu}J^{\nu}{}_{\kappa}b_{\lambda}J^{\lambda\kappa}}{\boxplus\boxdot} - \frac{p^2J^{\kappa}{}_{\kappa}b_{\mu}b_{\nu}J^{\mu\nu}}{\boxplus\boxdot} + \frac{p^4J^{\mu\nu}b_{\mu}b_{\nu}b_{\kappa}b_{\lambda}J^{\kappa\lambda}}{2\boxplus\boxdot^2}. \tag{41}$$

Next, we compute the residues in the poles of the propagator, whose corresponding dispersion relations were studied in Sec. III.

A. The first pole $\boxplus = p^2 + \xi(b\cdot p)^2$

This pole implies the dispersion relation (31). The corresponding residue obtained from (41) yields the following expression:

$$\mathrm{Res}\,(S)\Big|_{\boxplus=0} = J_{\kappa\lambda}J^{\kappa\lambda} - \frac{1}{2}\left(J^{\kappa}{}_{\kappa}\right)^2 - \frac{2\xi\left(b_\nu J^{\nu}{}_{\kappa}\right)^2}{(1+\xi b^2)} + \frac{\xi\left(J^{\kappa}{}_{\kappa}\right)\left(b_\mu b_\nu J^{\mu\nu}\right)}{(1+\xi b^2)} + \frac{\xi^2\left(b_\mu b_\nu J^{\mu\nu}\right)^2}{2\left(1+\xi b^2\right)^2}, \tag{42}$$

where $b^2 = b^\mu b_\mu$.

In the following calculations we will use the relations

$$J_{00} = \frac{p_a p_c}{p_0^2}J_{ca}, \quad J_{0a} = \frac{p_c}{p_0}J_{ca}, \tag{43}$$

obtained from the current conservation condition.

We should now specialize our analysis for two cases: a timelike background, $b^\mu = (b_0, \mathbf{0})$, and a spacelike background, $b^\mu = (0, \mathbf{b})$.

For the timelike background, $b^\mu = (b_0, \mathbf{0})$, the dispersion relation is written as Eq. (32), and the residue (42) becomes

$$\mathrm{Res}\,(S)\Big|_{b=(b_0,0)} = \frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{p_a p_c J_{ca}}{\mathbf{p}^2} + (J_{dd})\right]^2 + (J_{ab})^2 - (J_{dd})^2 - 2\frac{(p_c J_{ca})^2}{\mathbf{p}^2}. \tag{44}$$

It is exactly equal to the one stemming from the usual graviton mode $p^2 = 0$ of the Einstein-Hilbert's gravity which preserves unitarity. Therefore, the residue (44) is positive definite and the pole $p^2 + \xi(b\cdot p)^2 = 0$, is unitary for all values of b_0.

For the spacelike background, $b^\mu = (0, \mathbf{b})$, the dispersion relation is given by Eq. (34), or

$$(p_0)^2 = \mathbf{p}^2 - \xi\left(\mathbf{b}\cdot\mathbf{p}\right)^2. \tag{45}$$

The residue (42) for this background configuration is evaluated by using the following set of orthogonal vectors

$$\mathbf{u}_1 = \mathbf{u}_3 \times \mathbf{u}_b, \quad \mathbf{u}_2 = \mathbf{u}_3 \times \mathbf{u}_1, \quad \mathbf{u}_3 = \mathbf{p}/\left|\mathbf{p}\right|, \tag{46}$$

where $\mathbf{u}_b = \mathbf{b}/\left|\mathbf{b}\right|$ has the direction of the LV background. So the residue (42) results are

$$\mathrm{Res}\,(S)\Big|_{b=(0,\mathbf{b})} = \frac{1}{1-\xi\mathbf{b}^2}\left[\frac{2\left(S_1\right)^2}{1-\xi\left(b_3\right)^2} + \frac{\left(S_2\right)^2}{2\left(1-\xi\mathbf{b}^2\right)}\right], \tag{47}$$

with the terms

$$S_1 = \left[1-\xi\left(b_3\right)^2\right]J^u_{12} + \xi b_2 b_3 J^u_{13},$$

$$S_2 = \frac{(\xi b_2 b_3)^2 J^u_{33}}{1-\xi\,(b_3)^2} + J^u_{22}\left[1-\xi\,(b_3)^2\right] - J^u_{11}\left(1-\xi \mathbf{b}^2\right) + 2\xi b_2 b_3 J^u_{23}. \tag{48}$$

Here, we have used the definitions $\mathbf{b} = b_3\mathbf{u}_3 + b_2\mathbf{u}_2$, and $J^u_{ij} = \mathbf{u}_i \cdot (\mathbb{J}\mathbf{u}_j)$, with $\mathbb{J} = [J_{ij}]$ and J^u_{ij} being the spatial components of the tensor $J_{\mu\nu}$ in the basis $\{\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{u}_3\}$. The residue (47) is positive whenever

$$\xi \mathbf{b}^2 < 1. \tag{49}$$

As the magnitude of the LV background should be small, the unitary of this mode, for $b^\mu = (0, \mathbf{b})$, is assured. Hence, the pole $\boxplus$ provides causal and unitary propagating modes.

B. The second pole $\boxdot = (b\cdot p)^2 - b^2p^2$

It is a double pole implying the dispersion relation (37), which is physically sensible for $b_0 = 0$, that is, a spacelike background, $b^\mu = (0, \mathbf{b})$. Its residue, computed from the saturated propagator (41) is

$$\mathrm{Res}\,(S)\Big|_{\boxdot=0} = R_1 + R_2, \tag{50}$$

with

$$R_1 = -\frac{2b_\nu J^\nu{}_\kappa b_\lambda J^{\lambda\kappa} - J^\kappa{}_\kappa b_\mu b_\nu J^{\mu\nu}}{b^2\,(1+\xi b^2)}, \tag{51}$$

$$R_2 = \frac{(J^{\mu\nu}b_\mu b_\nu)^2}{2b^4\,(1+\xi b^2)}\frac{(1+2\xi b^2)}{(1+\xi b^2)}. \tag{52}$$

Using the identities (43), the quantities $J^{\mu\nu}b_\mu b_\nu$, $b_\nu J^\nu{}_\kappa b_\lambda J^{\lambda\kappa}$ and $J^\kappa{}_\kappa$ become

$$J^{\mu\nu}b_\mu b_\nu = \frac{(b_0)^2\,(\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbb{J}\mathbf{p})}{p_0^2} - 2\frac{b_0\,(\mathbf{b}\cdot\mathbb{J}\mathbf{p})}{p_0} + \mathbf{b}\cdot\mathbb{J}\mathbf{b}, \tag{53}$$

$$\begin{aligned} b_\nu J^\nu{}_\kappa b_\lambda J^{\lambda\kappa} = {} & \frac{(b_0)^2\,(\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbb{J}\mathbf{p})^2}{(p_0)^4} - 2\frac{b_0\,(\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbb{J}\mathbf{p})\,(\mathbf{b}\cdot\mathbb{J}\mathbf{p})}{(p_0)^3} + \frac{(\mathbf{b}\cdot\mathbb{J}\mathbf{p})^2}{(p_0)^2} \\ & - \frac{(b_0)^2\,(\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbb{J}^2\mathbf{p})}{(p_0)^2} + 2\frac{b_0\,(\mathbf{b}\cdot\mathbb{J}^2\mathbf{p})}{p_0} - \mathbf{b}\cdot\mathbb{J}^2\mathbf{b}, \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

$$J^\kappa{}_\kappa = J_{00} - J_{aa} = \frac{(\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbb{J}\mathbf{p})}{p_0^2} - J_{aa}, \tag{55}$$

where $(\mathbf{a}\cdot\mathbb{J}\mathbf{b}) = J^{lm}a_l b_m$, $(\mathbf{a}\cdot\mathbb{J}^2\mathbf{p}) = J^{ln}J^{nm}a_l p_m$. We now analyze this pole in two cases.

For $b_0 = 0$, the dispersion relation is

$$p_0 = \pm\frac{|\mathbf{p}\times\mathbf{b}|}{|\mathbf{b}|},$$

and the expressions (51)–(52) can be written as

$$\mathbf{b}^2\left(1-\xi\mathbf{b}^2\right)R_1=\frac{2\left(\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbb{J}\mathbf{b}\right)^2}{\left(p_0\right)^2}-2\left(\mathbf{b}\cdot\mathbb{J}^2\mathbf{b}\right)-\frac{\left(\mathbf{b}\cdot\mathbb{J}\mathbf{b}\right)\left(\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbb{J}\mathbf{p}\right)}{\left(p_0\right)^2}+\left(\mathbf{b}\cdot\mathbb{J}\mathbf{b}\right)J_{aa}, \tag{56}$$

$$\mathbf{b}^2\left(1-\xi\mathbf{b}^2\right)R_2=\frac{\left(\mathbf{b}\cdot\mathbb{J}\mathbf{b}\right)^2}{2\mathbf{b}^2}\frac{\left(1-2\xi\mathbf{b}^2\right)}{\left(1-\xi\mathbf{b}^2\right)}. \tag{57}$$

To simplify the above expressions, we use the orthonormal basis

$$\mathbf{u}_1=\frac{\mathbf{p}\times\mathbf{b}}{|\mathbf{p}\times\mathbf{b}|}=\frac{\mathbf{p}\times\mathbf{u}_3}{p_0},\ \mathbf{u}_2=\mathbf{u}_3\times\mathbf{u}_1,\ \mathbf{u}_3=\frac{\mathbf{b}}{|\mathbf{b}|}, \tag{58}$$

so we have the following expressions: $\mathbf{p}=p_2\mathbf{u}_2+p_3\mathbf{u}_3$, $\mathbf{b}=|\mathbf{b}|\,\mathbf{u}_3$, $\mathbf{p}\times\mathbf{b}=|\mathbf{b}|\,p_2\mathbf{u}_1$, $J^u_{ij}=\mathbf{u}_i\cdot(\mathbb{J}\mathbf{u}_j)$**,** with $\mathbb{J}=[J_{ij}]$ being J_{ij} the spatial components of the tensor $J_{\mu\nu}$**.** After some algebra we obtain the residue

$$\mathrm{Res}\,(S)\Big|_{\boxdot=0}=\frac{J^u_{11}J^u_{33}-2\left(J^u_{13}\right)^2}{1-\xi\mathbf{b}^2}+\frac{2p_2p_3J^u_{23}J^u_{33}+\left(p_3\right)^2\left(J^u_{33}\right)^2}{\left(p_2\right)^2\left(1-\xi\mathbf{b}^2\right)}-\frac{\left(J^u_{33}\right)^2}{2\left(1-\xi\mathbf{b}^2\right)^2}, \tag{59}$$

which is not definite positive, meaning, in general, a nonunitary excitation.

It means that this double pole provides excitations that spoil the unitarity of the model (ghost excitations) and, consequently, its physical consistency. The spoiling role can be, in principle, ascribed to the tensor operators $\tilde{\Pi}^{(2)}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda}$, $\tilde{\Pi}^{(\theta\Lambda)}{}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda}$, $\tilde{\Pi}^{(\Lambda\Lambda)}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda}$, which contribute to the scalar saturation (41). More specifically, the projector $\tilde{\Pi}^{(\Lambda\Lambda)}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda}$ is the responsible for the unitarity breaking, since it is the unique one associated with a second-order pole, a feature generally related to ghost excitations in quantum field theory.

Therefore, this gravity model despite have a simples pole (31) which preserves the tree-level unitarity, is nonunitary due to the presence of a second-order pole.

V. DEGREES OF FREEDOM

Now, we show that the gravitational field modified by the vacuum expectation value of the bumblebee field is still represented for a massless spin two symmetric tensor field with only two physical degrees of freedom. The equation of motion obtained from the effective Lagrangian (12) is

$$\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta}h^{\alpha\beta}=0, \tag{60}$$

with the operator $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ defined by Eq. (16). By saturating Eq. (60) with $p^\mu p^\nu$, we obtain the following constraint:

$$p_\mu p_\nu h^{\mu\nu}=p^2h, \tag{61}$$

where we have assumed $\xi \neq 0$ and $(b \cdot p) \neq 0$. As we can easily observe, due to the presence of the background field b_μ, we can still saturate Eq. (60) with the combinations $b^{(\mu}p^{\nu)}$ and $b^\mu b^\nu$. In addition we also perform the saturation of the equation of motion (60) with the metric $\eta_{\mu\nu}$. Such procedures imply the following equations,

$$0 = (b \cdot p)^2 h - 2(b \cdot p) b_{(\mu} p_{\nu)} h^{\mu\nu} + p^2 b_\mu b_\nu h^{\mu\nu}, \tag{62}$$

$$0 = \left[p^2 \left(1 - 3\xi b^2\right) + 2\xi (b \cdot p)^2\right] b_\mu b_\nu h^{\mu\nu} + (b \cdot p)^2 \left(1 - \xi b^2\right) h - 2(b\cdot\,) \left(1 - \xi b^2\right) b_{(\mu} p_{\nu)} h^{\mu\nu},$$

$$0 = -2\,(b \cdot p) \left(16\xi - \kappa^2\right) b_{(\mu} p_{\nu)} h^{\mu\nu} + p^2 \left(16\xi - 5\kappa^2\right) b_\mu b_\nu h^{\mu\nu} + (b \cdot p)^2 \left(16\xi - 3\kappa^2\right) h,$$

where we have used the condition (61). Thus, it is straightforward to see that these three equations imply the following constraint relations which $h_{\mu\nu}$ and b_μ must satisfy:

$$b_\mu b_\nu h^{\mu\nu} = 0, \tag{63}$$

$$b_{(\mu} p_{\nu)} h^{\mu\nu} = 0, \tag{64}$$

$$h = 0. \tag{65}$$

Immediately, from (61) it follows that

$$p_\mu p_\nu h^{\mu\nu} = 0. \tag{66}$$

We can achieve even more restrictions when we perform the contraction of Eq. (60) with p_μ or b_μ separately. By following a similar procedure as above, we obtain the following constraints:

$$p_\mu h^\mu{}_\nu = 0, \tag{67}$$

$$b_\mu h^\mu{}_\nu = 0, \tag{68}$$

representing a total of 8 additional conditions to be satisfied by the fields. Thus, the set of Eqs. (63)-(68) provides a total of 12 constraints which can be used to reduce the 14 initial degrees of freedom contained in the graviton and bumblebee fields. Consequently, we are left with only two physical degrees of freedom such as it happens for the Einstein-Hilbert's graviton.

Finally, by applying Eqs. (63)–(68) to Eq. (60), it becomes simply

$$\left[p^2 + \xi (b \cdot p)^2\right] h_{\mu\nu} = 0, \tag{69}$$

providing the correct energy-momentum dispersion relation (31) associated to the physical pole as previously determined. Therefore, we can conclude that the mechanism of spontaneous Lorentz-symmetry breaking triggered by the bumblebee field has modified the Einstein-Hilbert dispersion relation as: $p^2 = 0 \rightarrow p^2 + \xi(b \cdot p)^2 = 0$. We remark that the nonminimal coupling $B^\mu B^\nu R_{\mu\nu}$ has not produced massive modes for the graviton, at least at the linearized level.

It is worthy to note that some constraints here derived are similar to some gauge fixing conditions arising in the Hilbert-Einstein theory for the graviton field. Namely, the condition (61) is an analogue of the usual harmonic gauge, $\left(\partial_\mu \partial_\nu h^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}\Box h = 0\right)$, while the constraint given by Eq. (68) can be interpreted as a kind of axial gauge, as pointed out in Ref. [77]. This situation is similar to the one which happens in the Proca's model where the Lorenz condition ($\partial_\mu A^\mu = 0$) appears naturally from the equation of motion, but does not represent a true gauge fixing condition because Proca's model does not possess a local $U(1)$ gauge invariance. Here, the bumblebee field breaks spontaneously the diffeomorphism invariance, i.e., $h_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow h_{\mu\nu} + \partial_\mu \zeta_\nu + \partial_\nu \zeta_\mu$, of the Hilbert-Einstein gravity. Yet, the graviton remains massless with a modified dispersion relation.

We should still remark that in limit $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ the potential V vanishes, recovering a gravity theory endowed with Lorentz and diffeomorphism symmetry, which requires a gauge fixing condition for the propagator evaluation. This shows that limit $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ cannot be taken on the Feynman propagator just carried out. This is similar to the impossibility of taking $m \rightarrow 0$ in the propagator of a massive graviton to obtain the propagator of the massless graviton. A route to take such a limit is the Stuckelberg trick, used to address the van Dam-Veltman-Zakharov discontinuity in the massless limit of linear massive gravity [94].

VI. REMARKS AND CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we have investigated the Einstein-Hilbert action in the presence of the Lorentz-violating bumblebee field. We initially have considered the linearized version of this theory, including the bumblebee solution into the interaction term, $\sigma\sqrt{-g}B^\mu B^\nu R_{\mu\nu}$. The bilinear bumblebee action in the linearized graviton field $h_{\mu\nu}$ is added to the bilinear linearized Einstein-Hilbert action, implying the action of our interest. The corresponding Feynman propagator is exactly carried out using an extended basis of spin projectors based

on the Barnes-Rivers usual ones. The graviton dispersions relations are extracted from the poles of the propagator and used to study the physical consistency of the model. It is verified that the graviton possess two dispersion relations depending explicitly on the bumblebee field vacuum expectation value. The first one, $p^2 + \xi(b\cdot p)^2 = 0$, provides massless modes which are causal (for a positive coupling constant $\xi > 0$) and unitary (for any values of b_0 and small values of the background $|\mathbf{b}|$). The second dispersion relation, $(b\cdot p)^2 - b^2p^2 = 0$, gives causal but nonunitary modes which spoil the physical consistency of the model. Similar nonunitarity issues in Lorentz-violating gravity models were recently shown in [83, 98].

Acknowledgments

The authors R. V. Maluf and C. A. S. Almeida are grateful to CAPES and CNPq for financial support. R. Casana and M. M. Ferreira Jr are grateful to CAPES, CNPq, and FAPEMA. The authors acknowledge Professor José A. Helayël-Neto for useful discussions.

Appendix A: Barnes-Rivers operators and Lorentz-symmetry breaking

In the calculation of the inverse kinetic operator, necessary to determine the graviton propagator, we employ an algorithm based on the Barnes-Rivers rank-two spin projectors [86–91], given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{P}^{(1)}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda} &= \frac{1}{2}\left(\theta_{\mu\kappa}\omega_{\nu\lambda} + \theta_{\mu\lambda}\omega_{\nu\kappa} + \theta_{\nu\kappa}\omega_{\mu\lambda} + \theta_{\nu\lambda}\omega_{\mu\kappa}\right), \\
\mathrm{P}^{(2)}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda} &= \frac{1}{2}\left(\theta_{\mu\kappa}\theta_{\nu\lambda} + \theta_{\mu\lambda}\theta_{\nu\kappa}\right) - \frac{1}{3}\theta_{\mu\nu}\theta_{\kappa\lambda}, \\
\mathrm{P}^{(0-\theta)}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda} &= \frac{1}{3}\theta_{\mu\nu}\theta_{\kappa\lambda}, \qquad \mathrm{P}^{(0-\omega)}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda} = \omega_{\mu\nu}\omega_{\kappa\lambda}, \\
\mathrm{P}^{(0-\theta\omega)}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\left(\theta_{\mu\nu}\omega_{\kappa\lambda} + \theta_{\kappa\lambda}\omega_{\mu\nu}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{A1}$$

where $\theta_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} - \omega_{\mu\nu}$, $\omega_{\mu\nu} = p_\mu p_\nu/p^2$ are the transverse and longitudinal projectors, respectively. The usual spin operators for the subspace of symmetric rank-two tensors satisfy the following tensorial completeness relation:

$$\left[\mathrm{P}^{(1)} + \mathrm{P}^{(2)} + \mathrm{P}^{(0-\theta)} + \mathrm{P}^{(0-\omega)}\right]_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda} = \frac{\eta_{\mu\kappa}\eta_{\nu\lambda} + \eta_{\mu\lambda}\eta_{\nu\kappa}}{2}. \tag{A2}$$

The Barnes-Rivers basis was extended to gravity theories involving Lorentz-symmetry

violation in Ref. [84]. In such an extension, the spin operators induced by the Lorentz-violating background b_μ yields the whole set of structures listed below:

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_{\mu\nu} = b_\mu p_\nu + b_\nu p_\mu, \quad \Lambda_{\mu\nu} = b_\mu b_\nu, \tag{A3}$$

$$\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda} = \frac{\theta_{\mu\kappa}\tilde{\Sigma}_{\nu\lambda} + \theta_{\mu\lambda}\tilde{\Sigma}_{\nu\kappa} + \theta_{\nu\kappa}\tilde{\Sigma}_{\mu\lambda} + \theta_{\nu\lambda}\tilde{\Sigma}_{\mu\kappa}}{2}, \tag{A4}$$

$$\tilde{\Pi}^{(2)}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda} = \frac{\theta_{\mu\kappa}\Lambda_{\nu\lambda} + \theta_{\mu\lambda}\Lambda_{\nu\kappa} + \theta_{\nu\kappa}\Lambda_{\mu\lambda} + \theta_{\nu\lambda}\Lambda_{\mu\kappa}}{2}, \tag{A5}$$

$$\tilde{\Pi}^{(\theta\Sigma)}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda} = \frac{\theta_{\mu\nu}\tilde{\Sigma}_{\kappa\lambda} + \theta_{\kappa\lambda}\tilde{\Sigma}_{\mu\nu}}{\sqrt{3}}, \tag{A6}$$

$$\tilde{\Pi}^{(\theta\Lambda)}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda} = \frac{\theta_{\mu\nu}\Lambda_{\kappa\lambda} + \theta_{\kappa\lambda}\Lambda_{\mu\nu}}{\sqrt{3}}, \tag{A7}$$

$$\tilde{\Pi}^{(\Lambda\Lambda)}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda} = \Lambda_{\mu\nu}\Lambda_{\kappa\lambda}, \tag{A8}$$

$$\tilde{\Pi}^{(\omega\Lambda-a)}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda} = \omega_{\mu\kappa}\Lambda_{\nu\lambda} + \omega_{\mu\lambda}\Lambda_{\nu\kappa} + \omega_{\nu\kappa}\Lambda_{\mu\lambda} + \omega_{\nu\lambda}\Lambda_{\mu\kappa}, \tag{A9}$$

$$\tilde{\Pi}^{(\omega\Lambda-b)}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda} = \omega_{\mu\nu}\Lambda_{\kappa\lambda} + \omega_{\kappa\lambda}\Lambda_{\mu\nu}, \tag{A10}$$

$$\tilde{\Pi}^{(\omega\Sigma)}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda} = \omega_{\mu\nu}\tilde{\Sigma}_{\kappa\lambda} + \omega_{\kappa\lambda}\tilde{\Sigma}_{\mu\nu}, \tag{A11}$$

$$\tilde{\Pi}^{(\Lambda\Sigma)}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda} = \Lambda_{\mu\nu}\tilde{\Sigma}_{\kappa\lambda} + \Lambda_{\kappa\lambda}\tilde{\Sigma}_{\mu\nu}. \tag{A12}$$

We should mention that these projectors are not exactly the same ones of Ref. [84]. Indeed, note that projector $\tilde{\Sigma}_{\mu\nu}$ is symmetrized while projector $\Sigma_{\mu\nu}$ of Ref. [84] is not. The same holds for $\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda}$, $\tilde{\Pi}^{(2)}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda}$, $\tilde{\Pi}^{(\omega\Sigma)}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda}$, $\tilde{\Pi}^{(\Lambda\Sigma)}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda}$. Note that the upper indices (1) and (2) in the operators $\tilde{\Pi}^{(1)}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda}$, $\tilde{\Pi}^{(2)}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda}$ do not refer to its spin content. Some other interesting ways to defined projectors in gravity theories are found in Refs. [83, 88, 95–97].

[1] D. Colladay, and V. A. Kostelecky, Phys. Rev. D **55,** 6760 (1997).

[2] D. Colladay, and V. A. Kostelecky Phys. Rev. D **58,** 116002 (1998).

[3] S.R. Coleman, and S.L. Glashow, Phys. Rev. D **59,** 116008 (1999).

[4] V. A. Kostelecky, and S. Samuel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63,** 224 (1989).

[5] V. A. Kostelecky, and S. Samuel, Phys. Rev. D **39,** 683 (1989).

[6] V. A. Kostelecky, and S. Samuel, Phys. Rev. D **40,**1886 (1989).

[7] V. A. Kostelecky, and S. Samuel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66,** 1811 (1991).

[8] V. A. Kostelecky, and R. Potting, Nucl. Phys. **B 359,** 545 (1991).

[9] V. A. Kostelecky, and R. Potting, Phys. Lett. B **381,** 89 (1996).

[10] V. A. Kostelecky, and R. Potting, Phys. Rev. D **51,** 3923 (1995).

[11] V. A. Kostelecky, and R. Lehnert, Phys. Rev. D **63,** 065008 (2001)**.**

[12] G. M. Shore, Nucl. Phys. **B717,** 86 (2005).

[13] D. Colladay, and V. A. Kostelecky, Phys. Lett. B **511,** 209 (2001).

[14] O. G. Kharlanov, and V. Ch. Zhukovsky, J. Math. Phys. **48,** 092302 (2007).

[15] V.A. Kostelecky, and C. D. Lane, J. Math. Phys. **40,** 6245 (1999).

[16] R. Lehnert, J. Math. Phys. **45,** 3399 (2004).

[17] W. F. Chen, and G. Kunstatter, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 105029 (2000).

[18] B. Goncalves, Y. N. Obukhov, and I. L. Shapiro, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 125034 (2009).

[19] S.I. Kruglov, Phys. Lett. B **718**, 228 (2012).

[20] T. J. Yoder, and G. S. Adkins, Phys.Rev. D **86,** 116005 (2012).

[21] R. Bluhm, V.A. Kostelecky, and N. Russell, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79,** 1432 (1997).

[22] R. Bluhm, V.A. Kostelecky, and N. Russell, Phys. Rev. D **57,** 3932 (1998).

[23] R. Bluhm, V.A. Kostelecky, C. D. Lane, and N. Russell, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88,** 090801 (2002).

[24] R. Bluhm, and V.A. Kostelecky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84,** 1381 (2000).

[25] R. Bluhm, V.A. Kostelecky, and C. D. Lane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84,** 1098 (2000).

[26] R. Bluhm, V.A. Kostelecky, and N. Russell, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82,** 2254 (1999).

[27] V.A. Kostelecky, and C.D. Lane, Phys. Rev. D **60,** 116010 (1999).

[28] C. Adam and F. R. Klinkhamer, Nucl. Phys. **B607,** 247 (2001).

[29] C. Adam and F. R. Klinkhamer, Nucl. Phys. **B657,** 214 (2003).

[30] A.A. Andrianov, and R. Soldati, Phys. Rev. D **51,** 5961 (1995).

[31] A.A. Andrianov, and R. Soldati, Phys. Lett. B **435**, 449 (1998).

[32] A.A. Andrianov, R. Soldati and L. Sorbo, Phys. Rev. D **59,** 025002 (1998).

[33] A. A. Andrianov, D. Espriu, P. Giacconi, and R. Soldati, J. High Energy Phys. **0909** (2009) 057.

[34] J. Alfaro, A.A. Andrianov, M. Cambiaso, P. Giacconi, and R. Soldati, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **25,** 3271 (2010).

[35] V. Ch. Zhukovsky, A. E. Lobanov, and E. M. Murchikova, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 065016 (2006).

[36] R. Lehnert and R. Potting, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93,**110402 (2004).

[37] R. Lehnert and R. Potting, Phys. Rev. D **70,** 125010 (2004).

[38] B. Altschul,Phys. Rev. D **75,** 105003 (2007).

[39] C. Kaufhold and F. R. Klinkhamer, Nucl. Phys. **B734,** 1 (2006).

[40] A. P. Baeta Scarpelli, H. Belich, J. L. Boldo, and J. A. Helayël-Neto, Phys. Rev. D **67,** 085021 (2003).

[41] H. Belich, L. D. Bernald, Patricio Gaete, and J. A. Helayël-Neto, Eur. Phys. J. C **73**, 2632 (2013).

[42] V. A. Kostelecky and M. Mewes, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87,** 251304 (2001)

[43] V. A. Kostelecky and M. Mewes, Phys. Rev. D **66,** 056005 (2002).

[44] V. A. Kostelecky and M. Mewes, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97,** 140401 (2006).

[45] F. R. Klinkhamer and M. Risse, Phys. Rev. D **77,** 016002 (2008).

[46] F. R. Klinkhamer and M. Risse, Phys. Rev. D **77,** 117901 (2008).

[47] F. R. Klinkhamer and M. Schreck, Phys. Rev. D **78,** 085026 (2008).

[48] B. Altschul, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 041603 (2007).

[49] C. Kaufhold and F. R. Klinkhamer, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 025024 (2007).

[50] M. Schreck, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 065038 (2012).

[51] L. H. C. Borges, F.A. Barone, and J.A. Helayel-Neto, arXiv:1403.5953.

[52] G.Gazzola, H. G. Fargnoli, A. P. Baeta Scarpelli, M. Sampaio, and M. C. Nemes, J. Phys. G **39**, 035002 (2012).

[53] A. P. Baeta Scarpelli, J. Phys. G **39**, 125001 (2012).

[54] L. C. T. Brito, H. G. Fargnoli, and A. P. Baeta Scarpelli, Phys. Rev. D **87**, 125023 (2013).

[55] B. Agostini, F. A. Barone, F. E. Barone, P. Gaete, J. A. Helayël-Neto, Phys. Lett. B **708,** 212 (2012).

[56] E. O. Silva, and F. M. Andrade, Europhys. Lett. **101**, 51005 (2013).

[57] K. Bakke, H. Belich, and E. O. Silva, J. Math. Phys. **52**, 063505 (2011).

[58] V. A. Kostelecky and M. Mewes, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 015020 (2009).

[59] M. Cambiaso, R. Lehnert, R. Potting, Phys. Rev. D **85,** 085023 (2012).

[60] M. Mewes, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 116012 (2012).

[61] R. C. Myers and M. Pospelov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 211601 (2003).

[62] C. M. Reyes, L. F. Urrutia, and J. D. Vergara, Phys. Rev. D **78,** 125011(2008).

[63] J. Lopez-Sarrion, and C. M. Reyes, Eur. Phys. J. C **72**, 2150 (2012).

[64] C. M. Reyes, Phys. Rev. D **82,** 125036 (2010).

[65] C. M. Reyes, L.F. Urrutia, and J. D. Vergara, Phys. Lett. B **675**, 336 (2009).

[66] C. M. Reyes, Phys. Rev. D **87,** 125028 (2013).

[67] H. Belich, T. Costa-Soares, M.M. Ferreira Jr., and J. A. Helayël-Neto, Eur. Phys. J. C **41**, 421 (2005).

[68] H. Belich, L.P. Colatto, T. Costa-Soares, J.A. Helayël-Neto, and M.T.D. Orlando, Eur. Phys. J. C **62,** 425 (2009).

[69] B. Charneski, M. Gomes, R. V. Maluf, and A. J. da Silva, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 045003 (2012).

[70] R. Casana, M. M. Ferreira, R. V. Maluf, and F. E. P. dos Santos, Phys. Rev. D **86,** 125033 (2012).

[71] R. Casana, M. M. Ferreira, Jr., E. Passos, F. E. P. dos Santos, and E. O. Silva, Phys. Rev. D **87,** 047701 (2013).

[72] R. Casana, M. M. Ferreira Jr, R. V. Maluf, and F. E. P. dos Santos, Phys. Lett. B **726**, 815 (2013).

[73] V. A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. D **69,** 105009 (2004).

[74] R. Bluhm and V. A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. D **71,** 065008 (2005).

[75] Q. G. Bailey and V. A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. D **74,** 045001 (2006).

[76] V. A. Kostelecký and R. Potting, Phys. Rev. D **79,** 065018 (2009).

[77] R. Bluhm, S-H. Fung, and V. A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 065020 (2008).

[78] V. A. Kostelecký and J. D. Tasson, Phys. Rev. D **83,** 016013 (2011).

[79] V. A. Kostelecký, Phys. Lett. B **701**, 137 (2011).

[80] V. A. Kostelecký, N. Russell and R. Tso, Phys. Lett. B **716,** 470 (2012).

[81] J. E. G.Silva, C. A. S. Almeida, Phys. Lett. B **731,** 74 (2014).

[82] A. Ferrari, M. Gomes, J. R. Nascimento, E. Passos, A. Y. Petrov, and A. J. da Silva, Phys. Lett. B **652,** 174 (2007).

[83] B. Pereira-Dias, C. A. Hernaski, and J. A. Helayël-Neto, Phys. Rev. D **83,** 084011 (2011).

[84] J. L. Boldo, J. A. Helayël-Neto, L. M. de Moraes, C. A. G. Sasaki, and V. J. Vasquez Otoya, Phys. Lett. B **689,** 112 (2010).

[85] R. V. Maluf, Victor Santos, W. T. Cruz, and C. A. S. Almeida, Phys. Rev. D **88** 025005

(2013).

[86] K. J. Barnes, Ph.D. thesis at University of London (unpublished), 1963.

[87] R. J. Rivers, Nuovo Cim. **34** (1964) 386.

[88] E. Sezgin, P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Rev. D **21,** 3269 (1980).

[89] A. Accioly, S. Ragusa, H. Mukai, and E. de Rey Neto, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **39**, 1599 (2000).

[90] A. Accioly, A. Azeredo, and H. Mukai, J. Math. Phys. **43,** 473 (2002).

[91] A. Accioly, S. Ragusa, H. Mukai, and E. de Rey Neto, Braz. J. Phys. **30,** 544 (2000).

[92] M. Veltman, *Quantum Theory of Gravitation, in Methods in Field Theory*, edited by R. Bailian and J. Zinn-Justin, (World Scientific, Singapore, 1981).

[93] R. Casana, M. M. Ferreira, Jr., A. R. Gomes, and F. E. P. dos Santos, Phys Rev. D **82,** 125006 (2010).

[94] K. Hinterbichler, Rev. Mod. Phys. **84**, 671 (2012).

[95] C. A. Hernaski, A. A. Vargas-Paredes, and J. A. Helayël-Neto, Phys Rev. D **80,** 124012 (2009).

[96] C.A. Hernaski, B. Pereira-Dias, and A. A. Vargas-Paredes, Phys. Lett. A **374**, 3410 (2010).

[97] A. Accioly, J. A. Helayël-Neto, B. Pereira-Dias, and C. A. Hernaski, Phys. Rev. D **86,** 105046 (2012).

[98] C. A. Hernaski and H. Belich, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 104027 (2014).